



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/754,012	01/08/2004	Wayne Kenneth Carrigan	ROC920030319US1	7171
30206	7590	10/11/2006	EXAMINER	
IBM CORPORATION ROCHESTER IP LAW DEPT. 917 3605 HIGHWAY 52 NORTH ROCHESTER, MN 55901-7829			NEWAY, SAMUEL G	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2193	

DATE MAILED: 10/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/754,012

Applicant(s)

CARRIGAN, WAYNE KENNETH

Examiner

Samuel G. Neway

Art Unit

2193

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 38 are pending and are considered below.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: in the second paragraph of the Detailed Description, "e.g., due to release to release" should read "e.g., due to release".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 34 – 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 34 – 36 are directed to a computer system, but the system could be reasonably interpreted as being only software code since there is no indication that the software development environments must be more than software as claimed. Software code is functional descriptive material, per se, and therefore non-statutory.

Claims 37 – 38 are directed to a computer readable signal bearing medium bearing a program code. According to Applicant's specification this signal bearing medium can include communication links. Such are not statutory absent being claimed in combination with the necessary hardware to store, receive and convert the signal to computer usable code.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1, 4 – 10, 12 – 19, 22 – 27, 29 – 32, and 34 – 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Moser et al (US PGPub 2004/0117377).

Claims 1, 12, 16, 17, 19, 29, 34, 35, 37, 38:

Moser discloses a method of managing a plurality of software development environments coupled to one another through a cross development environment (Abstract), by:

detecting an update made in a first software development environment among the plurality of software development environments ("receiving updates... from the first client", paragraph 39, see also at least paragraph 82); and

dynamically modifying a mapping between the first software development environment and a second software development environment among the plurality of software development environments in response to an update ("mapping the updates from a format acceptable to the first client ... to a format acceptable to the second client "paragraph 39, see also at least paragraph 82).

Claims 4, 22:

Moser discloses the method of claims 1 and 19, and further discloses detecting the update comprises receiving a notification from the first software development environment ("client system may "publish" an updated master data object", paragraph 76, see also at least paragraph 28).

Claims 5, 18, 23, 36:

Moser discloses the method of claims 1, 16, 19 and 34, and further discloses notifying an administrator of the cross development environment in response to detecting the update ("request that the updated master data object be integrated into master database", paragraph 76).

Claims 6, 7, 24:

Moser discloses the method of claims 1 and 19, and further discloses notifying an administrator of the second software development environment in response to detecting the update and updating the second software development environment in response to notification of the administrator ("a client system may "subscribe " and receive... when they are published by another client ", paragraph 76).

Claims 8, 25:

Moser discloses the method of claims 1 and 19, and further discloses an update to content stored in the first software development environment ("updates of the characteristics for an object from the first client ", paragraph 39).

Claims 9, 26:

Moser discloses the method of claims 8 and 25, and further discloses an update to at least one of a product, component and release stored in a library repository in the first software development environment ("customer data and product data stored in local databases ", paragraph 4).

Claims 10, 27:

Moser discloses the method of claims 1 and 19, and further discloses an update to at least one of a tool, a parameter and a value in the first software development environment ("attributes to describe various aspects of the entity ", paragraph 4).

Claims 13, 30:

Moser disclose the method of claims 12 and 29, and further discloses routing the transaction to one of a plurality of cross development environment processes ("routing rules that contain information on how messages ...should be routed", paragraph 76).

Claims 14, 31:

Moser discloses the method of claims 13 and 30, and further discloses routing the transaction performed by a router process, the router process configured to perform at least one of failover and load balancing in connection with routing the transaction to a cross development environment process ("when messages are not successfully delivered, they are queued for later delivery", paragraph 87, fig. 4, items 210 and 212).

Claims 15, 32:

Moser discloses the method of claims 12 and 29, and further discloses communicating the transaction to the second software development environment, and retrying communication of the transaction to the second software development

environment in response to unavailability of the second software development environment ("when messages are not successfully delivered, they are queued for later delivery", paragraph 87, fig. 4, items 210 and 212).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 2 – 3, and 20 – 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moser et al in view of Admitted Prior Art.

Claims 2, 3, 20, 21:

Moser discloses the method of claims 1 and 19 as discussed above where the contents of the software development may be data objects, such as customer objects or product objects (paragraph 4) but does not explicitly teach problem tracking information or source code as claimed in the instant claims. Applicant discloses, in the "Background of the Invention", that it was known in the art to share problem tracking information and source code ("software") between different developers working on the same project, at the time the instant invention was made. It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to share problem tracking or source code along side the other data objects shared in order to allow all involved environments in the software development access to updated information even when the environments operate in a heterogeneous system.

9. Claims 11, 28, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moser in view of Comito et al (US Patent 6,195,658).

Claims 11, 28

Moser discloses the method of claims 1 and 19, but does not disclose a wildcard as claimed in the instant claims.

Comito discloses a method of updating database records analogous to Moser's mater database records, using one or more wildcard fields (col. 5, lines 9-16)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include wildcard fields in Moser's database records in order to represent a plurality of entries using a single symbol (see Comito col.5, lines 9-16 and lines 43-56)

Claim 33

Moser discloses a method of managing a plurality of software development environments coupled to one another through a cross development environment (Abstract), by:

detecting an update ("receiving updates", paragraph 39) made in a first software development environment among the plurality of software development environments (paragraphs 39, 82); and

dynamically modifying a mapping between the first software development environment and a second software development environment among the plurality of software development environments in response to an update (paragraphs 39, 82).

But Moser fails to disclose a wildcard as claimed in the instant claim.

Comito discloses a method of updating database records analogous to Moser's master database records, using one or more wildcard fields (col. 5, lines 9-16)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include wildcard fields in Moser's database records in order to represent a plurality of entries using a single symbol (see Comito col.5, lines 9-16 and lines 43-56).

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Gockel et al. (US PGPub 2004/0044730) discloses a dynamic access by a client of data stored in a master database where the data is mapped according to mapping rules defined by the client.

Hopwood et al. (US Patent 6,223,343) discloses a computer system and method to track and control element changes throughout application development amongst different groups.

Cutler et al. (US Patent 5,832,274) discloses a method and system for transferring files from a first environment to a second environment.

Hossain et al. (US Patent 5,581,749) discloses a system and method for maintaining codes among distributed databases using a master database.


Art Unit: 2193

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Samuel G. Neway whose telephone number is 571-270-1058. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thur 8:00AM - 5:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on 571-272-3719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SGN
09-26-06


Kakali Chaki
Supervisory Patent Examiner

**KAKALI CHAKI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**